

Appl. No.: 10/003,377  
Amdt. dated April 6, 2004  
Reply to Office action of March 8, 2004

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action date March 8, 2004, the Examiner required restriction to one of two groups of claims and required election of one of four species. The Applicant responds as follows.

#### **I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

The Examiner identified Claims 1-21 as being in a first group of claims and claims 22-25 as being in a second group of claims. The Applicant cancels claims 22-25, but may file divisional applications for the cancelled claims.

#### **II. ELECTION OF SPECIES**

The Examiner identified four species of claims, with Figures 1, 5, 6, and 7 each representing one species. The Examiner identified claim 1 as generic.

The Applicant asserts that claims 1-3 and 11-13 are all generic claims. The limitations found in each of claims 1-3 and 11-13 are found in each of Figures 1 and 5-7, and, therefore, claims 1-3 and 11-13 are generic to the four species shown in Figures 1 and 5-7.

Claims 4 and 14 include network connections corresponding to the species of Figure 1. Claims 5-6 and 15-16 include consolidated network connections corresponding to the species of Figure 5. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 include consolidated serial port connections corresponding to the species of Figure 6. Claims 7-8 and 17-18 include consolidated parallel port connections corresponding to the species of Figure 7.

The Applicant elects the species of Figure 5. Therefore, claims 4, 7-10, 14, and 17-20 have been withdrawn from consideration but must be rejoined and fully examined for patentability if one of the generic claims from which they depend is held allowable.

#### **III. CONCLUSIONS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

**Appl. No.: 10/003,377**  
**Amdt. dated April 6, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of March 8, 2004**

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash  
PTO Reg. No. 47,231  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400